

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6011647 (Geschwentner). Withdrawal of the rejection is now sought in view of the amendment of claim 9 as discussed below.

Claim 9 has been amended to distinguish over Geschwentner. Amended claim 9 specifies “no optical element ... which emits light ... replaces the removed assembly in the illumination beam path.” As can be understood from Fig. 2 of Geschwentner, slide 21 is movable between a first position wherein a collector lens system 2 and a subsequent field stop 3 are positioned to receive light from light source 1 having filament 20, and a second position wherein the lens system 2 and field stop 3 are removed and a second light source 22 having filament 22’ is positioned where field stop 3 once was such that the first light source can be shut off. In the first slide position, the an image of the filament is projected onto the retina, and the reflection of this projection (red reflex) illuminates the cornea from inside the eye. Because this illumination is dangerous for the retina, Geschwentner provides the second slide position wherein second light source 22 replaces the field stop at a position conjugate to the object plane at the cornea, such that light is focused on the cornea and the retina is less stressed and homogeneously illuminated.

Rather than employing a second light source, the present invention employs a single light source and provides a normal mode and an intentionally dispersed mode in which the retina is homogeneously illuminated. Claim 9 expressly excludes a mechanism replacing the removed assembly of optical elements with a light source as taught by Geschwentner.

In view of this, the invention of claim 9 represents an improvement over Geschwentner. Favorable consideration of amended claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geschwentner. Withdrawal of the rejection is now sought in view of the amendment of claim 16.

Claim 16 is amended in a manner similar to claim 9 in order to distinguish over Geschwentner. Accordingly, the remarks made above for claim 9 apply with respect to the method of claim 16. Therefore, favorable consideration of amended claim 16 is kindly requested.

Conclusion

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions, the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

HODGSON RUSS LLP

By

George L. Snyder, Jr.
Reg. No. 37,729

GLS/

One M&T Plaza, Suite 2000
Buffalo, New York 14203-2391
(716) 856-4000
DATED: October 29, 2004

BFLODOCS 993193v1